School of Computer Science
Council Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, June 26th, 2018
10:00 – 12:00PM, MCKN 313

Present – *Faculty***:** D. Calvert, D. Chiu, R. Dara, D. Flatla, D. Gillis, G. Grewal, A. Hamilton-Wright, S. Kremer, P. Matsakis (Interim Director), J. McCuaig, D. Nikitenko, C. Obimbo, J. Sawada, S. Scott, F. Song, F. Wang, M. Wirth; *Staff:* D. Byart, C. Hosker, J. Hughes, K. Johnston, G. Klotz, S. Mousseau (Recording Secretary), D. Rea; *Student Representatives:* J. Fraser

Regrets – *Faculty***:** L. Antonie, R. Chaturvedi, X. Li, B. Nonnecke, D. Stacey, M. Wineberg, Y. Xiang; *Staff:* L. Zweep; *Student Representatives:* F. Hasson

1. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the agenda be approved (A. Hamilton-Wright/D. Gillis)
Amendment: That the item on cybersecurity be moved to #8 (Joe/Pascal)
In Favour: All. **MOTION PASSED**

2. Approval of Minutes from April 17, 2018

Motion: That the minutes from April 17, 2018 be approved (A. Hamilton-Wright/ D. Gillis) In Favour: All. **MOTION PASSED**

3. Approval of Minutes from May 1, 2018

Motion: That the minutes from May 1, 2018 be approved (A. Hamilton-Wright/ D. Calvert) In Favour: All. **MOTION PASSED**

4. Approval of Minutes from May 29, 2018

Motion: That the minutes from May 29, 2018 be approved (D. Calvert/J. McCuaig) In Favour: All but 2. Abstentions: 2. **MOTION PASSED**

5. Interim Director's Remarks – Pascal

Council Meetings

The next Council meeting will be a two-hour meeting on Thursday, July 26th, with the Dean as special guest, and there will be an important motion to vote on. Please be sure to attend. If ever we do not have quorum, we will arrange an electronic vote.

New Director

The Search Committee is meeting on June 27th and again on July 4th.

New Faculty

The Associate/Full Professor position in cybersecurity was posted last week. The deadline for applications is July 22. The plan is to have a shortlist ready by August 1st. Interviews will happen with the new Interim Director in September. A. Dehghantanha knows some people that will apply. While we don't expect too many applications, we expect at least a few good candidates. The start date is expected to be January 1st.

Teaching-Focused Faculty

The Dean and the Provost recently had a conversation that was approved for sharing. The Provost is open to converting the two CL positions to tenure-track. The minimum we can expect is that the CL positions will be renewed. The Provost is currently in Japan, but should be back this week. As soon as P. Matsakis has a final answer on the positions, he will notify the faculty.

New Staff

S. Mousseau will be going back to school in the fall. We are currently looking for a replacement Office Clerk. The first interview is scheduled for July 4th. Because this position is a one-year part-time contract, it does not have to be posted publicly. If you have anyone that may be interested, please pass along their information. Expected start date is September 1st.

We are also hiring a new Instructional Support Coordinator. The position was posted on June 25th and the deadline for applications is July 3rd. Interviews should happen between July 9th and 13th or the week of July 16th to 20th. Expected start date is September 1st.

SAS Accommodations

P. Matsakis presented a slide that was also shown earlier this year. If you have an SAS request that you believe you cannot accommodate, please let the Director know, as there may be a way to make it work.

A. Hamilton-Wright shared that SAS does not want to notify faculty of registered students until it's too late. He suggested that the lack of communication causes problems for instructors. C. Obimbo added that instructors used to be notified in advance, but now it's very last minute. He asked if faculty should encourage those students to come forward. M. Wirth said that the student needs to self-identify

as a student with a disability. He suggested that it could be added to the course outline that a student with disabilities should identify themselves with the course instructor. D. Chiu added that when the student registers for the course, they should self-identify. J. McCuaig shared that many SAS students don't always know when they're going to need accommodations. They may have a condition that flairs up so they can't always plan. Also, they are encouraged to go along with the mainstream as much as possible. P. Matsakis agreed and added that while we can encourage students to come forward, it's not always easy to come forward with this kind of information.

Student Complaints

A complaint from a student registered with SAS has now escalated to a formal complaint with the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario. The student needed a quiet environment for their lab test. The SAS office did not have the appropriate hardware/software, so the instructor asked the student to take the test with everyone else. The University is now the respondent in the complaint. The instructor and Director will meet with the University's internal legal counsel and UGFA representatives.

There was also a student who has complained that an instructor publicly ridiculed them in a lecture. Many times, an instructor may receive an email, and rather than responding to the email, the instructor responds in class for the benefit of all of the students. However, faculty should be very careful with what is said and how it is said, as there may be a student who feels ridiculed. In this particular case, P. Matsakis contacted the Office of Student Affairs and was told he needed to investigate the situation. There was no evidence, and the case was closed.

6. **Renovations and Expansion Committee – Pascal**

Thornbrough

The new window frames for THRN 2418 have arrived. The work area is fenced off and the computer lab should be closed soon. This renovation has been discussed for years and it's finally happening. It has been paid for by the Dean, and should be completed by the end of July.

Reynolds

The overall result of the renovations will be beautiful, and the renovated building will be night and day compared to the building before the renovations. Nonetheless, P. Matsakis presented some reasons for frustration.

During the process of renovating, the Renovations and Expansion Committee has been asked to review thousands of pages of material. There is a lot of work involved. In particular, the Committee had to review room data sheets multiple times. These sheets

cover everything, e.g., from the material of each door to the motion of each door. The Committee would carefully review each line and each box, correct the same mistakes over and over again, but, in the end, when you go on site, you can see that despite all this the mistakes have been made. For example, as far as P. Matsakis can remember, a card reader was requested for the large seminar room on the first floor, but the Committee found out that none would be installed (and is currently working on the issue); on the other hand, a card reader was not requested for the Director's suite, as only staff will be using it, but a card reader will be installed; we did not want a vision panel in the small meeting room, but there is a vision panel now; we did not want a door between the mail/copy room and the adjacent storage room, but a door has been installed.

The furniture layout for Reynolds was completed in November 2017 which was followed by six months of waiting. There was then 48 hours to review five different furniture suppliers. The contract was awarded to Mayhew and the first meeting happened last week. There was then one hour to finalize all of the finishes and furniture colours. It takes six to eight weeks for the furniture to be delivered and the Committee is hoping for the best. Most furniture should be installed by August 15th, but some may be installed as late as August 31st.

Last fall, the Committee was limited in terms of the furniture that could be ordered because of money restrictions. And a few months ago, the Committee was told there was a shortage of a quarter million dollars. In the end, however, there was no shortage at all, and there may have been enough for more or better furniture. For example, the Committee wanted to provide standing desks for the graduate students as well, but had to abandon the idea. F. Song asked if everyone will still receive a standing desk. P. Matsakis replied that, yes, every faculty and staff member will have an electric, height adjustable sit-stand desk.

The old wooden double doors in the main entrance are beautiful. A lobby with glass doors was added to the entrance. The glass doors required a wall dropping down from the ceiling and the entrance now looks odd and does not make sense.

The Committee requested transom windows be added near the ceiling to let light into the corridor and grad pods. The office ceilings are really high, but now there's a wall dropping down from the ceiling to meet the glass walls around the grad pods. When inside the grad pods, the transom windows won't be seen as they sit above the wall. M. Wirth asked if the walls were meant to be half high glass walls. D. Rea replied that there is a coating being put on the walls to create the half high look.

P. Matsakis shared that the Committee planned for the possibility of splitting the graduate lounge in two, in case more offices were needed. Instead of two doors, however, there is one door and an opening larger than a door where a glass panel will be installed. The Committee has no idea where this design comes from.

Finally, note that tiling has begun in the third-floor washrooms. The basement is the least advanced, but the frames are now up and the glass panels and drywall will be installed soon. The outside glass wall is almost finished.

7. Physical Space Committee – Michael

The Committee has allocated graduate students to pods. There are three pods. One pod is on the third floor and two pods are on the second floor. This means that a supervisor on the third floor may have their grad students on the second. All the students under one supervisor are together in one pod. Pods have been allocated to students who are not in the final stages of their degree. There is room for 54 grad students and 47 of those spots have been assigned. An additional 11 grad students have been marked as defending in the summer or early fall, and can use the remaining spots if needed. If a student does not use their desk, they will lose it. The School is not providing machines for these desks. We don't have the luxury HP deal from years ago, so supervisors will need to provide machines. If need be, there may be some Raspberry Pies and leftover Macs from upgrades.

G. Grewal asked what a student spot looks like. M. Wirth responded that it's a desk, and D. Rea added that there is a lockable storage area underneath.

There is a series of rules for graduate pods and the graduate lounge. Rooms will be kept in reasonable condition. We cannot have a garbage tip in the grad rooms as before. There will be no gaming in the grad pods. If a student has a mobile call, they should take it outside. No cooking equipment allowed in the pods at all. They're against fire code. The grad lounge is for grad students only. If a student wants to make popcorn, they need to watch it cook to make sure it doesn't burn. No smelly foods should be cooked in the microwave at all. Students should tidy up after themselves and make sure to recycle. The same rules go for the faculty/staff lunch room. It needs to be kept clean.

D. Flatla asked if allowing gaming in the grad pods might provide some goodwill considering the students have been shunted over to VMI over the period of the renovations. M. Wirth replied that gaming cannot be allowed in the grad pods, as the pods are not very big and this would be distracting to other students. Also, students should use the big meeting rooms for talking in groups. P. Matsakis suggested that the students can play in the grad lounge if they want. D. Rea added that there is a proposal for arranging some limited time specific events. For example, THRN has great graphics cards and might be suitable for a gaming event. He suggested L. Zweep might be able to help organize something like that.

We will use one of the two double offices in Reynolds for our sessional instructors, and one for a research lab. The other promised research labs will be in MacLachlan, where four offices will be kept aside for us (in the northeast corner). In two years, however, MacLachlan will probably be renovated and we'll need to find another solution.

8. Cybersecurity Program Discussion Group – Joe

Update

J. Sawada mentioned that there is a history of ill-will between the School and previous administration, so we are in repair mode now. Two years ago, there was a vision for the MSc in cybersecurity, but we only had one person with expertise (C. Obimbo). At the time, J. Sawada shared that he was not convinced we would be able to hire people to fill the roles as needed. He stepped in as the Associate Director of Graduate Studies and the development of the program was added to his list of tasks. He's now quite pleased with it. While the proposal for the program was met with a healthy bout of skepticism on February 6th, this gave P. Matsakis the ability to go in and request additional resources for the School.

Recent Developments

J. Sawada shared that we've received significant engagement from A. Dehghantanha and H. Khan during proposal discussions. They've joined in on meetings via Skype. C. Obimbo and R. Dara are helping to push the program forward as well. The third new faculty hire will help bolster the current roster. Moreover, the lab capacity has increased from 24 to 36, which is a positive move.

With the help of David Whittle, we have found four cybersecurity experts who are willing to be external reviewers. Also, there was a meet and greet last week with our partners (McAfee, BlackBerry, IBM, Cisco), and it went fairly well. There was a lot of feedback about what they thought about the program, internships, and co-op opportunities. They were very interested in the pre-requisites for the program and have found that a lot of the best candidates for cybersecurity did not necessarily come from a CIS background. This is an item for discussion at a later point. What we do need from them is firm commitments in terms of hardware and software.

A. Hamilton-Wright asked for clarification on the idea of relaxing the pre-requisites. J. Sawada replied that our partners would like us to relax the rule about needing a major or minor in CIS, rather than lowering the grade point average.

Meeting with Dean Yesterday

To this point, the discussion has been focused on the subject of funding and having enough faculty for the program, but we have not discussed staffing, and we have not discussed the benefits of developing the program.

The Dean showed that she is supportive of the program and really wants to develop the trust that's eroded over the years. It will take some time, but she is willing to work on it. She has agreed to fund an admin position for one year to help get the cybersecurity program off the ground. There is also a commitment to transfer $5500 per domestic student to the School (RAG funding), and the School is free to spend the funds in any way that supports graduate activities. There is no commitment for international students just yet, but the Dean is willing to work with the Provost to set something up. She mentioned that SoE is getting up to 50% of the international student fees.

Given everything that has already been agreed to, J. Sawada feels that it's not a good idea to ask for more support at this point.

Yes to Cybersecurity: Benefits for the School

The committed graduate transfer funds (RAG) can be used to support and strengthen existing research-based graduate programs. The increased engagement and support from industrial partners is good for the School. All of this will help increase the profile of the School and strengthen our case for a new building. It will create a pipeline of HQP for a small subset of faculty. It will also demonstrate our willingness to work with the Dean and Provost.

No to Cybersecurity: Benefits for the School

The space allotted to the cybersecurity lab would be freed up, but we may lose the space in MacLachlan. There would be no change to the staff. H. Khan's two-year CL position would not be renewed. With no masters to develop, A. Dehghantanha likely wouldn't stay long. Our third hire may stay. Focus would be put on existing programs or on planning for new programs. The relationship with the Provost would probably be damaged.

Next Steps

The most important next step is to get the School support behind the program. There will be a motion of support for the next Council meeting. Following the vote, assuming the Council votes in favour, a full proposal will be completed, and we will have to finalize the contribution of all of the partners. There are a number of avenues including hardware, software, technical support, and scholarships. All of the partners were enthusiastic about the program and are willing to spend money on it as well.

Discussion

S. Kremer asked what resources we have confirmed for the short and long terms. He expressed concern about the number of faculty that will be teaching in the cyber security program. He asked about, e.g., the administrative and hardware costs. He suggested that it would be good to have a balance sheet listing the short term and long term costs in addition to where the support will be provided, as well as what we would lose if the program does not move forward.

P. Matsakis replied that there are letters of support from our partners for in-kind contribution of up to $1.8M. This could be hardware, software and possibly tech support.

C. Obimbo noted that the offers of support are firm, though not specific. He added that there are training labs that IBM and Cisco would like to share. They also have co-op opportunities and are willing to take in students.

S. Kremer asked to see the information in a written document. C. Obimbo asked if he wants to see the information written out or the information sent directly from the industry partners. S. Kremer replied that it would be nice to see a contract, but if not, having the promises laid out and described would be helpful. He would like the documentation as backup in case the program fails as a result of broken promises by industry partners. J. Sawada agreed that this would be helpful. He added that this was the point of the Advisory Board meeting. The goal is to now firm up agreements, but he is unsure of the timeline. P. Matsakis replied that we have only these letters of support at this time, and the vote will need to happen before we can get specifics.

J. McCuaig noted that she likes the idea of a spreadsheet where the information is laid out not just for funding, but for other resources as well, like teaching tasks. She added that she is worried about the existing graduate courses. She argued that scheduling might not allow us to offer courses outside of the cybersecurity offerings. She asked how we will cope.

D. Flatla suggested that attaining specifics at this point could hurt us as by the time the program gets going, the offers would be old and therefore the hardware could be out of date. There should be a sense of continued support so that we are not working with ten-year-old equipment in ten years. He went on to say that this could be a really good program for international students and if we could offer work visas it could be very attractive to recruiting international students. D. Flatla added that money could be allocated to PhD students who could help manage the labs. The money could also help with PhD scholarships. He noted that this is a great template for doing other course-based masters in the future. While it is a risk, it is a hopeful risk.

G. Grewal noted that this is a move that may only benefit a few faculty. J. Sawada replied that it will benefit all of the graduate students. G. Grewal replied that we have an existing graduate program and that getting international students isn't too much of a problem. Good domestic students, however, are hard to find. He asked how this program will affect the number of domestic graduate applicants available to anyone who is not part of the cybersecurity program. He suggested the number will go down. He then asked if there was a way to get something on paper that shows if the program fails due to withdrawn support by the University and we lose faculty, those positions will be filled again. He added that in the past, SoE has sucked resources away from the other units within CPES. He suggested that the proposal looks great on paper, but he is looking at past history and how to predict what may happen down the road. G. Grewal went on to ask how this local cybersecurity program fits within the global context.

P. Matsakis replied that the Provost is committed to replacing every faculty member who retires. It is not written in stone, and even if it was, it could fall through, but she did say that. G. Grewal answered that this is a good start.

R. Dara asked for clarification on G. Grewal's comment that the other faculty members would be losing graduate candidates. G. Grewal replied that if the program rises, the pool of available students will go down.

S. Scott shared that she feels the same as D. Flatla. There is great potential for a template for developing additional course-based masters programs that may be relevant to other faculty members who are not working with the cybersecurity program. She then asked if this is being considered as a co-op program. J. Sawada replied that there is an intent to have a semester-long work experience in industry, but that is not finalized yet. S. Scott then noted that there is an overlap between cybersecurity and AI. She suggested there could be great potential for students coming from this program and maybe landing in someone else's lap once they've completed it.

D. Rea shared that according to D. Whittle CCS does not have the resources and cannot provide technical support. Therefore, we will need to make sure that the new program will not interfere with the work that D. Rea and K. Johnston need to do for SoCS. C. Obimbo mentioned that the Cybersecurity Program Discussion Group Committee has been meeting with CCS to discuss this.

D. Chiu suggested that the Guelph-Humber comparison that has been mentioned is not entirely accurate in the sense that cybersecurity is being driven by industries whereas the Guelph-Humber initiative was driven by the government. He added that in the long term support may fade and will depend on the success of the discipline. There is a risk in the mid term, but for 20-30 students with support in the industry, it's a well-controlled and managed risk.

J. Sawada shared that there was a survey for third and fourth year students and they were all very interested and supportive of moving forward with the development of the cybersecurity program. These are students already interested in security, so they are not being taken from another graduate program.

M. Wirth asked how cross-listed courses will be dealt with, since undergraduate students who take these courses will not be able to take them as graduate students. J. Sawada replied that they will need to take one of the other courses. There will be four cybersecurity courses offered each semester (fall and winter), including one cross-listed course, and the program will only require successful completion of six courses.

J. Sawada also answered "no" to S. Kremer's earlier question about losing teaching tasks. P. Matsakis followed up to say that we have three new faculty in cybersecurity, which leads to almost eight new teaching tasks. D. Calvert suggested that it is really more like six since A. Dehghantanha is replacing a retiring faculty member.

C. Obimbo suggested that the RAG funding provided for the domestic students could be put towards encouraging more women to enter the program, perhaps with scholarships. He added that the fee should be set now as it's difficult to adjust it later on. M. Wirth disagreed and said that a lot of MBA's start this way and transition to full-fee paying. C. Obimbo clarified that he was thinking of an EMBA. M. Wirth replied that the School would need some traction and a reputation to offer an EMBA. He added that EMBA's are normally funded by companies that want their employees to go and get one, but that it's not usually offered during the day.

D. Calvert shared that he is really happy to see the RAG funding coming in for students in the program. But he suggested that if we don't get the numbers we're expecting, the Provost may ask for the faculty members back and will put the cost on the School. He reiterated that having the costs and benefits laid out would be helpful.

9. Academic Staff Hiring Committee – Andrew

The TA positions have been posted, and the postings will come down on July 3rd. Faculty should encourage students to take the Qualtrics survey.

10. Academic Integrity Committee – Gary

This item was tabled to the next Council meeting due to a lack of time.

11. Any Other Business

K. Johnston announced that the following weekend, SoCS passwords are disappearing forever. He will be sending out an email to all faculty and staff. The switch will require the system to come down, but it should not be down for long. When logging in on July 2 or 3, please use the central ID. D. Calvert asked for clarification on whether this is for the login and password. K. Johnston replied yes. He added that it is a phased rollout and currently everything seems to be working smoothly.

P. Matsakis wrapped up the meeting by noting that J. Sawada will provide a costs and benefits spreadsheet for the development of the cybersecurity program, and a vote on the program will happen on July 26th.

Meeting adjourned at 11:57am